

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

87

DATE: JUL 11 2011 OFFICE: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER FILE: [REDACTED]

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(L) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, denied the nonimmigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The AAO will dismiss the appeal.

The petitioner filed this nonimmigrant petition seeking to extend the beneficiary's L-1B status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(L), as an intracompany transferee with specialized knowledge.

The director denied the petition on May 4, 2009, concluding that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge or that she would be employed in a capacity requiring specialized knowledge. The petitioner filed a timely appeal on June 5, 2009.

A review of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) records indicates that the beneficiary of this petition was also the beneficiary of an approved L-1B classification nonimmigrant petition filed shortly after the denial of this petition, and is currently the beneficiary of an approved L-1A classification petition filed by the instant petitioner in March 2011. While the petitioner has not withdrawn the appeal in this proceeding, it would appear that the beneficiary is presently employed by the petitioner in L-1 classification and the issues in this proceeding are moot. Therefore, this appeal is dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.